

Modern Psychology on God and Man

by Leo J. Elders s.v.d

Since the end of the 19th century psychology as an independent science or technique has known a spectacular development. Some years before the end of the 19th century while studying certain mental disorders in his patients the Austrian physician Josef Breuer discovered that the symptoms of psychic disorder in some of his patients disappeared when he could make them remember, under hypnosis, a traumatic event in their past. This medical experience gave rise to the discovery of the unconscious, sc. A part of our human mind in which events from infancy up to mature age are stored and may sometimes create disorders. Sigmund Freud took interest in Breuer's work, repeated the experiments and further developed the theory of the role of the unconscious in our lives. In later years, from 1914 to 1939, Freud elaborated in theory of the role of the unconscious part of the mind, mainly to explain such phenomena as religion.

Freud's background

In order to understand better Freud's theories on culture and religion some remarks on his religious and scientific background will be helpful. Freud's Jewish identity has not exercised any positive influence toward religious belief. The climate at home was definitely a-religious and even atheistic. As a child of his time Freud adhered to the wide-spread belief in science as giving the only valid explanation of reality. As many scientist of his time Freud was a materialist in this sense that whatever reality there is now is a product of evolution from initial matter according to fixed laws. Every event has a cause: every psychic event and all human actions have causes and can be predicted, if the causes are known. This view of Freud is correct up to a certain extent, since whatever happens must have a cause. But Freud's theory becomes very questionable when he exclude or overlooks such causes as free will or man's free decision, and argues that whatever happens in

daily life and in our consciousness results from factors in the unconscious part of our mind. So that one can say that Freud shared all his life the positivistic, deterministic and atheist views of his professors at the faculty of medicine of the University of Vienna. He remained convinced that religion and science are mutually exclusive. Science, so Freud, accepts no other sources of knowledge than verifiable observation; religion, on the other hand claims such sources as revelation and intuition, which no one can verify and which propose the products of wishful thinking¹. Psychoanalysis carries scientific research further into the depths of the human mind.

Freud accepted without any criticism the theory of evolution, sc. The development of civilization implies a slow, but steady progress of the human kind from the state of higher animals so that the distinction between animals and man is fading. Moreover he made his own Lamarck's theory that properties acquired during life can be inherited by posterity, although this view was discredited by further experiments. Jung would develop this point and began to postulate the existence of a collective unconscious, in which experience of past generations are stored, experiences which may pop up all of a sudden in the dreams of individuals born much later.

Freud on the unconscious

By insisting on the role of the unconscious Freud and his followers have shown some of the unconscious or semi-conscious mechanisms, which incline us to do certain things and may also reduce moral responsibility for some of our acts. An interesting example is homosexual practice, which may be triggered by certain hidden trauma's, slumbering in the unconscious. Freud developed his theory of the unconscious by assigning a dominant role to the sexual instinct. Our infancy would be characterized by a sexual desire for the mother arising in boys, the so-called Oedipus complex. Girls would develop a sexual desire for their father. Breuer

and Jung did not follow Freud on this point and refused to make the sexual instinct a dominant factor. Freud himself. On the other hand, pretended that by showing the existence of the Oedipus complex psychoanalysis had made clear why some people adhere to religious truth. In this way he believed that he could unmask religion as something of purely human origin.

The origin of religion

The origin of religion, he argues, is to be found in the ambiguous relation of the son to his father. Originally people lived in a horde (like apes). The young males were tired by the pretensions of a vicious chief, who kept them away from the females, and so they killed this leader, but later they came to regret the murder and started to venerate his memory², using the means people employ to gain the attention and favors of others, that is to say prayers and sacrifices.³ Without further explanation Freud seems to assume that people preserved this feeling of guilt because of the murder of the ancestor of the clan over tens of thousands of years. He brought it into relation with his theory that almost every young boy suffers from an *oedipus complex*, that is, wants his father to disappear, die or be killed so as having his mother to himself. This personal experience repeats the original murder of the dominant male, ontogeny repeats phylogeny, -the so-called basic biological law, formulated by Haeckel and since rejected by almost all biologists. In this *Totem und Taboo* Freud⁴ explains the image of God as our father by means of this gratuitous theory of the murder of a dominating male at the beginning of history. This murder was followed by remorse and led to attempts to reconcile this dead father by means of sacrifices. In his essay *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921) Freud argued that in the response of believing Christians to Christ their relation to their primeval father is coming to life again. So religion is based on a sense of guilt (arising from having killed the dominant father figure, and then longing for him and idealizing him). In this very strange theory, not based on any observation, there is something of Darwin's theory of the

struggle for survival. Furthermore it has been noted by critics that Freud presents his account of religion exclusively in terms of the relationship of father and son. Women have no place in it and are apparently objects to be desired and possessed.

Critique and further theories

Ethnologists and psychologists have shown that the *Oedipus complex* is not so general and does not nearly occur so frequently as Freud assumed. Among certain populations it is not found at all. Malinowski pointed out that the severe attitude towards his sons, the father may adopt and brandished by Freud as the cause of a revolt against him, serves the purpose of preparing them for their future tasks in a particular society. But for Freud the Oedipus complex is universal and so religion as the veneration of a severe father-figure is an expression of suppressed feelings, in particular of repressed sexuality; so Freud calls it a neurosis. It is an illusion, he says, resulting from wishful thinking. At this point Freud introduces the superego, a set of rules and laws formulated to repress aggressiveness and excessive sexual freedom. Freud compounded the improbabilities of his theory by claiming that the original murder of the father was repeated when Moses was killed. This second murder was followed by a period of reconciliation and atonement⁵. As a result monotheism was born. According to Freud the concept of God is a product of man himself that is of this anxieties and desires. Primitive man personified natural powers; to gain their favor he started using the same means as we use to gain the favor of human beings. In a further development these personified natural forces lost their human traits; to a certain extent the divine was separated from nature and where nature shows defects or does not help us, it is complemented by recourse to religion. This is the thesis of *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* (1927)⁶. In this way religion is an illusion by which people cheat themselves, or a neurosis; religious people try to free themselves from feelings of anxiety and guilt. These feelings result from the inevitable frustrations which daily life brings along.

In his *Moses and Monotheism* (1939) Freud tried to explain the origin of monotheism as professed by orthodox Jews, Christians and Muslims. Monotheism would be the return of the repressed image of the father, stimulated by a strong sense of guilt because of the original crime committed against the father. But now believers submit themselves to this father-image and obey his commandments. According to Freud monotheism would stimulate obsessive neuroses. Feelings of guilt because of another murder committed, sc. That of Moses provoked the desire for a Messiah and atonement. Critics have rejected this arbitrary theory; it is contrary to historical facts and not better than a wild hypothesis born out of a grudge against religion⁷. Jung says of this theory of Freud that the latter placed his personal feelings above truth⁸.

Freud is willing to concede that religion brought some advantages to people, but mostly it makes us miserable. It has not made man happy and locks him up in a childish attitude. It should be replaced by rational arguments and people should give up the illusion that there is a God or another world. In general theory of Freud and of those who follow him downscales man's life to the level of animal passions; religious representations have no objective value, but are the product of man's desires. Certain psychoanalysts of Freud's school even reproach Christianity with suppressing man's natural feelings and causing mental diseases.

Karl Jung on the importance of religion

Before giving a final evaluation of Freud's theories we must briefly consider the view of Karl Jung on religion and man's idea of God. Karl Jung, the Swiss psychologist, who was a dominating figure in psychology in the twentieth century, is much more positive with regard to religion than Freud, whose views he shared initially. Jung replaced Freud's sexual libido as the driving force of people by a polyvalent force, of which sexual energy is only one part. Religion is not the result of guilt feelings, even if obsessions may occur in religious persons. Religion is not the cult of a substitute for the

father. For Freud the unconscious is the storehouse of ideas and feelings repressed from conscious life. Jung assigns a much larger task to the unconscious. A newly born baby has not a totally empty mind, but is equipped with a set of archetypes, that is psychic structures and symbols, which are partly a collective heritage and in part manifestations of the structure of the soul or modes of functioning of the human mind. These archetypes themselves remain unknown but express themselves in images. Dreams are more than the expression of an infantile libido, for they sometimes bring archaic insights to the surface. So there is besides the personal unconscious the collective unconscious. Among the archetypes, the archetype of God is the most profound. It has been engraved on our mind that it is a formal structure of the mind and this means that God should have a place in our lives. However, "God" as conceived by Jung is not more than such a formal structure of our mind. It is impossible to prove God's existence. Even the question whether God really exists or not, is futile to Jung⁹. Because religion originates from a structural element of our psyche, people say that it has its source outside them, although this is false, according to Jung. The result is that Jung locks us up in a psychic world; in which our Self is the central value.

With regard to the contents of this archetype of God, Jung says that the various religions fill it is according to their particular beliefs. What they put forward is always symbolic, and never expresses what really is. Although Jung regards the dogma of the Trinity the most sacred of religious symbols, it does not hold any metaphysical truth. He considers the idea of God a archetype, a basic structure of the human mind, which must be respected in order to avoid mental illness. On this point Jung contradicts Freud: religion is valuable and even necessary for mental health. It helps man to become what he should be and to reach inner wholeness. According to Jung Western man misleads himself when he thinks that he does not need God and religion¹⁰. For Jung religion does not do more than serve our mental health. It results from a

careful consideration of the archetypes.

One may see a confirmation of Jung's view about the necessity of religion in the fact that down through history all the peoples of the world have been religious, and that modern western man, apparently a-religious, is nevertheless in search of religious depth as is shown by his interest in Eastern religions and methods of meditation. But Jung stresses that nobody should worry about whether God really exists. It is enough to experiment the archetype of God, which helps us to live in peace. Thus Jung makes religion depend on a psychic structure and claims that we can only know the psychic states within ourselves. In the last analysis according to Jung a experience of God is an experience of the deepest level of the unconscious and so God's transcendence is set aside. God cannot and does not address himself to man: there is no revelation from the outside.

Jung's theory compared to that of Freud

In a certain sense Jung's view of religion represents a definite progress, compared to Freud's theory. He shows the positive value of religion and recommends his patients to be religious so as to reach a state of mental equilibrium and health. However, critics pointed out that his theory of the archetypes present in the unconscious is far from certain. They also drew attention to the fact that the existence of a collective unconscious as a store house of human experiences going back as far as hundreds of years ago is highly unlikely, but most of all they rejected Jung's exclusively psychological and phenomenological approach which made him reduce everything and even God, to mere psychic events.

A point in Jung's theory, which has given rise to much dispute and provoked reflection, is his theory of the shadow. In a late publication, sc. His Answer to Job (1951) Jung argues that God, as alive in the belief of Christian, is not just a figure full of goodness and mercy, but is also violent and jealous. So he places good and evil right in the heart of God himself. In presenting

his view Jung denies that evil is a privation of the good. This at first sight surprising conclusion which seem to make God contradictory in himself, is better understood when we keep in mind that according to Jung God is an archetype and that in this archetype different images flow together, so that one day people may represent God as the fullness of perfection, but on other occasions as being jealous and even cruel. Obviously at best Jung is describing the feeling some people have about God. His statements are far removed from a philosophical and theological consideration of this question.

Belief in God from the point of view of traditional philosophy

Mankind has always been religious. Anthropologist and ethnologist have never discovered a tribe, which did not have some form of religion. From times immemorial the Japanese people have venerated divine powers, which they thought to be at work in the cosmos. No need is felt to demonstrate the existence of God, because the divine is the depth of things and the mysterious power behind the world of plants, animals and cosmic order. Aristotle speaks of two sources of religious knowledge, sc. cosmic phenomena which demand a explanation and impressions on our mind¹¹. In his encounter with the material world man experiences a reality which transcends his own force: the cycle of the seasons, the development and growth of plants and animals, the magnificent panoply of stars in the nocturnal sky. Although these are essential to his life, they do not depend on him. Astonishment and admiration lead people to the conclusion that they have a master. This conclusion is based on the principle of causality, that is to say: when something comes into being or when there is a change, a cause is required. Nothing changes just by itself¹².

Thus we maintain against Jung that religious belief is not innate. His theory of God as an archetype must be revised. There are in fact elements in our mind, which make us conclude that God exists and is the independent Creator of the world and of man. But these elements

are our experience of the world and the so-called first principles, such as the principle of causality: whatever comes in being or whatever changes requires a cause.

The oldest forms of religious belief

What to think of the oldest forms of religious belief? Some authors speak of a development in stages: at first people would have practiced totemism, at a later stage animism, which was followed by anthropomorphic representations of the divine. Finally higher forms of religion were reached, such as monotheism. It is true that among certain peoples an evolution of their religion had taken place. In Japan Buddhism introduced new ideas and became somewhat complementary to shintoism. However, it is far from certain that all the different tribes pass through these stages, and it can be shown that the oldest forms of religious belief acknowledged a fatherly figure as the divine master¹³. The so-called stages in the evolution of religious thought seem to exist in a shifting equilibrium; some tribes have not passed through them and such phenomena as magic, totemism and even polytheism might be later, negative developments and may not be the initial form of religion.

As long as man lives in close contact with nature, he adopts almost spontaneously a profoundly religious attitude, as if forced by what he observes and as the most natural thing to do. However, in our modern world he has become more removed from a direct contact with nature and is all the time concerned with man-made products. As a result he considers natural things mainly from the point of view of their usefulness for himself and places his own desires and pursuits in the center of his interest. In this way this spontaneous religious feeling may fade, as in fact it seems to happen in several countries of Western Europe. However, it does not mean that religion is outmoded or wrong, but that modern man has taken a direction, which leads him, further away from what he should be and should do. This is confirmed by Jung's conclusions on the essential impor-

tance of the religious dimension in us and of the need to practice religion in order to stay healthy.

The role of the unconscious

With regard to the theory of the unconscious we must acknowledge the existence of a hidden zone in our mind, of which we are not aware but which nevertheless exercises some influence on our life. As is well known our mental life begins at an early stage of childhood, say when we are about two years old. The child then begins to form basic concepts of "being real" of "place" and "time", as well as those of "cause" and "effect". It also formulates the first principles, such as a thing is not something else or whatever becomes needs a cause. We have no distinct recollection of this acquisition of basic knowledge, yet we use it all the time. For instance, when we see that a chair has been knocked over in our room, we "know" that someone has entered it during our absence, since nothing is turned upside down by itself. We use data stored in the unconscious part of the mind. There are also first principles of the moral order, such as "one should respect one's parent". These principles are present in the mind even if we are not always explicitly aware of them. To a certain extent one could place here some of Jung's archetypes, such as those of "mother" and "father", or also of the Self striving for wholeness. It means that a basic driving force of our being is that toward perfecting ourselves in agreement with our nature. Yet we want to determine ourselves with the help of analysis, which are these basic structures. Moreover, we deny that there is an archetype of God in the sense of an innate idea of God. According to Jung the new-born has not a totally empty mind, but is equipped with a store of mental contents. It is not unlikely that, at the level of sense cognition, some instinctual knowledge is inherited, as happens in animals, but we do think that at the level of intellectual knowledge each of us has to learn and to equip his mind with basic concepts and insights, the so called principles of being.

The rationality of the conviction the God exists

I would like to draw your attention to the supreme rationality of religion and religious practice. In the course of the ages the great philosophers and members of the world religions have argued that the existence of God is a fact that can be proven scientifically. From the early Greek philosophers until the moderns proofs have been developed to show the existence of a Supreme Being, the Creator of the world. Some neo-positivist authors, such as Alfred Ayer and Anthony Flew, argue that talking about God in non-empirical; there is no experience no verification of his existence. Only material things that can be verified by immediate experience are real¹⁴. An unfortunate result of these neo-positivistic theories is that the belief has spread that there is an unbridgeable gap between science and religion; religion would belong to fairyland, to infantile thinking and would contradict reason. In reality, however, religion is eminently reasonable. For more than two thousand years the greatest philosophers have formulated demonstrations of the existence of God; mystics have sounded the depth of man's dialogue with a divine Master and, in their artistic creations, painters, sculptors, poets and composers have expressed the mysterious depth of divinity. Belief in God has its basis in our daily experience of the world: the astonishing order of things, the development of living beings, the collaboration between things demand an ordering mind, since chance or spontaneous contingent development is no explanation; movement demands an ultimate source which itself never begins to move, a First Cause which is always acting: the coming-in-being and the perishing of things demand some stable, necessary being as their sources; likewise such perfections as truth, goodness and beauty demand a source. When understanding and recognizing our dependence on God, our Maker, and realizing that God keeps us in being day after day and gives us this beautiful world to live in, religious worship becomes eminently reasonable and even a duty.

In this way we utterly reject Jung's position as

to the possible or probable un-reality of the object of religious experience. To Jung it does not seem to matter whether God is real or not, as long as we are happy cherishing this archetype. But this position is untenable. Why be religious if in the world of existing things nothing corresponds to it? It would be self-deception. Moreover, why would there be this archetype and the natural urge to be religious if there is nothing above us?

We concede that God is hidden to us. His greatness surpasses the range of the human intellect. This does not affect the reality of God, but it means that as we know him from this world he has made, our knowledge is partial. Philosophers speak of analogy: we know real things about God, such as his being the First Cause and the source of all activity, supreme perfection and wisdom which directs things to their ends. But at the same time we must acknowledge that he is different from the causes of our daily experience. So we speak of the hidden God, who lives in an inaccessible light and whom no one has seen. We know that the Creator of this world with all its marvels exists, and it is precisely the mission of Christianity to show the way that leads to God and to offer the means that make it possible one day to meet and see him.

The basic driving force (libido) in human beings

A second point I would like to make is that of the basic driving force of the human mind, Freud and Jung speak about, sc. Sexual libido for Freud, and a polyvalent libido for Jung. For Alfred Adler man's basis drive is that of self-assertion. What to make of these views? In classical philosophy, animals are equipped with striving, called, with a Latin word, natural and acquired appetite. Both types of appetite are on the unconscious and conscious level. Some examples: there is the appetite to keep oneself alive, the appetite to develop oneself, to procreate, to live together with other people, in short to exercise the functions typical of our human nature. Because of these appetites we are at-

tracted by certain objects. All things to which we have a natural inclination are perceived as good, their contraries as things to be avoided¹⁵. One may agree with Freud and Jung as to the presence of a driving force in our psyche, but we say that this basic force takes several forms. It shows itself on the level of the intellect and leads us to gather knowledge. It shows itself in inter-human relations in the urge to constitute human communities and to become friends with other people. Other inclinations concern the preservation of our life and the survival of mankind by procreation. One cannot simply reduce these inclinations to one libido, which is directed to sexual pleasure as Freud does. We notice here a prejudice of Freud, sc. that whatever happens in our psyche is determined by sexual libido. Even Jung overlooks to a certain point man's basic obligations, outlined by the appetites we have mentioned. In reality our basic appetite is directed to the good, that is to the fulfillment of the needs and desires of our natural being. It takes on several forms such as the inclination to preserve our own life, to associate with others to found a family, to develop our knowledge and to acknowledge the Maker of the world. These inclinations must not remain blind forces but as we grow up we must learn to direct these forces by our reason. Likewise such feelings as love must also be controlled by the mind. A real, unselfish love of friendship and the desire to do good to others is possible. Egoism is not an unavoidable characteristic of all human beings¹⁶.

Theories about man

For Freud, as well as for many evolutionist scientists there is no sharp dividing line between higher animals and man. To them there is no transcendent God, that is, there is no spiritual reality besides this material world and man does not have an immaterial mind. He has no other future than to die and to be dissolved into cosmic matter. While we must fully acknowledge the good effects psychoanalysis sometimes has by helping disturbed people to regain mental equilibrium and wholeness, it is also a fact that the concentration on the darker and animal side

of their being may make people disregard the spiritual dimension of their soul.

Man occupies a unique place among living beings. Different explanations have been proposed of his uniqueness. The most widely accepted definition of man is that he is a *rational animal*¹⁷. This classical view stresses the immateriality of the human mind. However, a nowadays fairly widespread opinion does not accept more than a gradual difference between man and higher animals. Somewhat closer to the traditional idea of man is the theory of existentialist philosophers such as Heidegger who argue that man's essence is to be *ex-sistent*, in the sense of a being, which reflects on itself and goes beyond what is immediately given. In this way man is much different from animals. However they unilaterally stress a secondary property of man such as his experience of contingency or anxiety and his capacity to raise questions.

Plato teaches that there is a fundamental difference between man and animals, for man possesses a mind, but the animals do not¹⁸. Therefore man is the highest being in the world¹⁹. Aristotle has been the first philosopher to study the correspondence between man's body and animal organisms, but he shows that the human mind does not belong to the material order²⁰. The spiritual views of man dominated until in the modern time. The Roman author Cicero gave a fine formulation of what man is when he said: "This shrewd, provident and talented animal, gifted with memory, with reason and deliberation, which we call man, has been made by the highest god so as to be exceptional. Man alone among so many animal species is gifted with reason"²¹. However, modern empiricist or materialist authors deny that man holds a particular position. Anthony Flew writes: "Human beings have these abilities not because the presence in them of an immaterial mind, but simply because of the way the human animal has evolved"²². It is true that biologically speaking man does not have any special organ that he alone would possess. From the point of view of anatomy the human brain is not altogether dif-

ferent from that of higher animals.

However, when we analyze our most typical activity, *sc.* Thinking, we reach a different conclusion. A striking characteristic of thinking is that we form general (universal) concepts such as "house", "horse" "flower" which apply to all the different houses, horses and flowers, and their differences, but grasps their essential contents, common to all the different specimens of the group. What is common to houses of different shapes and built with different materials is that they are a structure, which protects man and his belongings from outside influence. Or the general concept of a flower, leaving out its particular form and color, is that of a part of a plant which contains its reproductive cells surrounded by petals in shining colors so as to attract insects and impress the human observed by its beauty. This means that the human mind overlooks all the particular types of flowers and sees a common aspect in them. Since every human being forms such universal concepts, the human mind itself is universal and universalizes its object, whereas an animal perceives the individual²³. Connected with this is language, by which man expresses his concepts, and makes statements about things and their properties.

Animals practice certain forms of communication, one of which is by emitting sounds. They may use signals, but do not make sentences, with a subject, verb and object. Certain animals such as dogs and chimpanzees can even learn to use certain signs to express desires or approval. But animals communicate about things which are immediately important for their survival (e.g. the presence of food, of an enemy, a threatening storm or rain. Birds sing to make their presence known and to indicate their territory). By human language we mean the use of sentences and words with a general meaning as signs, which indicate a great number of individual things. Moreover, language also consists in statements which can be purely objective. For instance, "today the sky is clearer than yesterday". Speech is a most ingenious way of communication. There is no special organ for speech: we use vocal cords which vibrate in an acoustic

tube; the cavity of mouth and nose must have the proper form, and the tongue must be pliable so as to be able to increase or reduce the available space in the cavity of the mouth in order to form the different vowels. It is impossible that by mere chance development human beings could have discovered the use of speech and adapted the different organs. Scientists have nowhere found a intermediary stage between animal communication and human language²⁴.

A second indication of the immateriality of the human mind, that is of its difference from material things is the fact that we can reflect about ourselves, whereas the senses cannot do so: the eye cannot see itself, the ear does not hear itself. Material things have parts and are extended in space. A thing, which returns to itself and reflects on itself lifts itself above what it is, creates so to say a new dimension. Thought can penetrate itself, return to itself, and is intimately present to itself²⁵.

So we have found two amazing properties of the human mind, *sc.* Its universality and its being present to itself. But since we are corporeal beings our thinking is limited by the horizon of this material world and we cannot get a good grasp neither of our own mind nor of immaterial reality such as God. A consequence of the universality of the human mind is that our choices are free, in other words that we have a free will. We can briefly explain this as follows: the human mind is universal and knows that the good objects it pursues are all particular good objects. Since the human will follows the mind, its basic inclination is toward the good in general. Therefore the choice of a particular and limited good, such as going on vacation to Hakone or Toba, cannot decisively attract the will, - in other words, the will remains free in its choice.

If the human mind is immaterial, it is not subject to decay and corruption, in other words man's spiritual self does not disappear when the body dies, but begins a new existence carrying, with it not its material belongings nor desires typical of its life in the body, but spiritual treas-

ures, such as the wisdom and virtues it has acquired. In the light of the above explanations the role of psychology stands out better: it must help man to find harmony and peace of heart, by making him see his true being and integrate his different feelings, emotions, passions and desires into his most basic inclinations. It must help him to listen to the voice of his deepest being, to understand his vocation and his destination. As Plato once wrote, the human mind is a celestial plant, which will flower in a different existence after this life.

Endnotes

¹ New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis (1933) (Penguin Freud Library, 2,206-207).

² Freud does not explain why apparently they conceived this chief as somehow alive after his death. We shall come back to this point in the second part of this lecture.

³ This is the thesis of *Totem and Taboo* of 1913.

⁴ *Gesammelte Werke*, IX, 169. Cf. also his *Moses und der Monotheismus* (1939).

⁵ *Moses and Monotheism* (1939, written shortly before his death).

⁶ *Gesammelte Werke*, XIV, p. 337.

⁷ Cf. Norman Kiell, *Freud without Hindsight*, Nadison (CT) 1988.

⁸ *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, (1962), London, Fontana Press 1993.

⁹ *The Symbolic Life* (Collected Works 18, 706-707).

¹⁰ *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, New York 1933.

¹¹ *De philosophia*, fr. 10 R.

¹² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, II-II 85, 1; I, 13, 10.

¹³ See W. Schmidt, "Wrsprung der Gottesidee. Eine weiterführende Überschau", in *Anthropos* 16/17 (1921/1922, 1006-1051. Cf. also P.N. D'Elia, "Il Dio degli antichi Cinesi", in *Gregorianum* 18 (1957), 193-256.

¹⁴ A. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic*, (Dover Publication, p. 114); A. Flew and A. MacIntyre, *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, London 1955, 10-08.

¹⁵ *Summa theologiae* I-II, 94, 2.

¹⁶ *Summa contra gentiles*, III, c. 153.

¹⁷ This definition of Stocis has its source in Aristotle. Cf. Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhonianoe Hypotposes*, II, 26.

¹⁸ *Timoeus* 92 A; *Protagoras* 321 C.

¹⁹ *Republic* 563 C; *Laws* 902B.

²⁰ *De anima*, book 3.

²¹ *De legibus*, I, 7, 22.

²² *A Rational Animal*, Oxford 1978.

²³ Cf. *Summa theologiae* I 75, 5; *Summa contra gentiles*, II, c. 50.

²⁴ See George A. Miller, *Language and Speech*, San Francisco 1981.

²⁵ For this argument see St. Thomas, *Expositio in librum de causis*, lectio 7.